which one tends to be unduly preoccupied." Selfishness arises, not from the clamor of wants, but from "inadequacy of imagination." Hostility there is, but it does not arise out of interferences, but out of incompatibilities. Rivalry is recognized, but it is a mere sporting competition and has nothing to do with practical aims. Resentment flames out, not against those who thwart us, but against those who entertain " an injurious thought regarding something which we cherish as a part of our self." Surely this ethereal psychology goes with three meals a day and a bank account. The mirroring of the selves of all in the mind of each may keep in order sated, comfortable people, but hardly persons with unsatisfied wants yapping at their heels. One wonders if the study of moral psychology in the confessions of Montaigne, Rousseau, Emerson, Goethe, and other geniuses, may not mislead one as to the forces that hold commonplace persons in orderly relations.

While, then, this deeply pondered book will doubtless bring many sociologists under the conviction of sin, it is not certain they will be willing to go along with the author in his extremely subjective interpretation of the social reality. Sociology occupied with groups of creatures marked in soul and body by ancient conditions of survival— these groups being in definite relations to other groups, and to a physical environment— must be an objective science. It would scarcely meet the expectations formed of it if it admitted that "mind . . . . is the *locus* of society."

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA.   EDWARD ALSWORTH ROSS.

Essai d'une philosophie de la solidarité. By LÉON BOURGEOIS. Paris: Alcan, 1902.

IT is increasingly doubtful if Marx's *Klassen-Kampf* is the sole means to the amelioration of the lot of the masses. Certain it is that a significant change is coming over the leaders of the working class in France and Germany. As they win support among the intellectuals, as they find themselves making substantial headway, they appeal less to class hatred and more to the sentiment of justice. They would vanquish their opponents in the sphere of moral ideas as well as in the political arena.

A sign of this new temper is the series of lectures and discussions on social solidarity given in the *École des hautes études sociales* and presided over by Léon Bourgeois, formerly prime minister of France. The aim of M. Bourgeois is to recast the canons of justice in the light of sociological thought. The moral philosophers, owing to a defective

analysis of the social relations, have drawn the sphere of duties too narrow. Sociology shows there is in society a transmitted fund of knowledge and organization which individuals are able to take advantage of only in very unequal degrees. He argues that those who are in a position to utilize this social capital owe something to those debarred by circumstance from exploiting this capital. Furthermore, there are risks attending social progress as well as gains, and these risks should be compensated out of these gains and not borne by innocent individuals. Let us, says M. Bourgeois, mutualize that portion of our prosperity which is of social origin. Let us reduce those inequalities of condition which arise, not from the natural inequalities of men, but from the unequal distribution of the risks and advantages of social progress.

M. Bourgeois is neither communist nor collectivist. He believes in individual liberty and private property, but he would subject them to heavier ethical obligations than the old moral individualism has imposed. Only by acquitting his debt to society can one moralize his possessions. Only by recognizing the facts of solidarity and discharging the resulting obligations does one achieve a sphere of righteous liberty.

From his principle of mutualizing social capital and social risk our author deduces the justice of gratuitous state education, restriction of child labor, limitation of the hours of labor, workingmen's insurance, old-age pensions, progressive taxation, the social appropriation of surplus value, and the suppression of special privileges and monopolies. The favor these measures have won outside of the working class is largely due no doubt to the very considerations the French statesman has set forth so eloquently. When it is remembered that this statesman has helped to shape the new civic and moral teaching France imparts to her children, one will beware of belittling these "ideologies."

<div align="right">EDWARD ALSWORTH ROSS.</div>

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA.

A History of Factory Legislation. By B. L. HUTCHINS and A. HARRISON, B.A. (Lond.). With a Preface by SIDNEY WEBB. Westminster: P. S. King & Son, 1903. 8vo, pp. xviii+372.

THIS, the first adequate history of the English factory laws, is not merely a collection of facts; its intelligent presentation and interpre-